

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 729

SP 041 773

AUTHOR Pittard, M. Michele  
TITLE Developing Identity: The Transition from Student to Teacher.  
PUB DATE 2003-04-22  
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).  
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)  
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Personal Narratives; Practicums; Preservice Teacher Education; \*Student Teacher Attitudes; Student Teachers; \*Student Teaching; Teacher Knowledge  
IDENTIFIERS \*Identity Formation

## ABSTRACT

The narrative inquiry from which this paper comes examined the experiences of five student teachers as they negotiated the transition from student to teacher. The researcher was interested in looking at the ways in which student teachers' beliefs about teaching and knowledge of teaching evolved over the course of the student teaching practicum. Issues of identity, power, and voice quickly emerged as dominant storylines in the stories of all the participants involved. This paper specifically explores the underlying tensions and challenges associated with issues of identity, power, and voice that characterize the student teaching practicum. Such tensions and challenges were manifest in the participants' stories, and the purpose of this paper is to examine how they inhibited identity development in the student teacher participants. Although tension can often create powerful learning experiences, the tension associated with identity, power, and voice seemed to impede these student teachers as they sought to construct their own identity as teachers. The paper raises questions about the structure and purpose of the student teaching experience and challenges teacher educators to rethink field experiences, pedagogy, and program curriculum in ways that will enable preservice teachers to begin developing their teaching selves (Contains 63 references.) (Author/SM)

ED 481 729

**Developing Identity: The Transition from Student to Teacher**

**M. Michele Pittard, Ph.D.  
Wabash College  
P.O. Box 352  
Crawfordsville, IN 47933**

**Paper presented at the  
Annual Meeting of the  
American Educational Research Association**

**April 22, 2003**

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND  
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS  
BEEN GRANTED BY

M. MICHELE PITTARD

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1

2

### **Abstract**

The narrative inquiry from which this paper comes examined the experiences of five student teachers as they negotiated the transition from student to teacher. Specifically, I was interested in looking at the ways in which student teachers' beliefs about teaching and knowledge of teaching evolved over the course of the student teaching practicum. Issues of identity, power, and voice quickly emerged as dominant storylines in the stories of all the participants involved. This paper specifically explores the underlying tensions and challenges associated when issues of identity, power, and voice that characterize the student teaching practicum. Such tensions and challenges were manifest in the participants' stories and the purpose of this paper is to tease out how they inhibited identity development in the student teacher participants. Although tension can often create powerful learning experiences, the tension associated with identity, power, and voice seemed to impede these student teachers as they sought to construct their own identity as teacher. The paper raises important questions about the structure and purpose of the student teaching experience, and challenges teacher educators to rethink field experiences, pedagogy, and program curriculum in ways that will enable preservice teachers to begin developing their teaching selves.

*In the realm of teacher knowledge, where is identity?*

*In the process of learning to teach, where is identity?*

*In the mire of field experiences, where is identity?*

*In the cycle of staff development, where is identity?*

*Identity exists within our innermost self and evolves through our outermost persona.*

Recently in the literature on teacher education, the development of one's identity as a teacher is being touted as one of the most important pieces in the process of learning to teach (Borich, 1999; Britzman, 1991 & 1994; Danielewicz, 2001; Knowles, Cole, & Prestwood, 1994; Lortie, 1975; McClean, 1999; Quan, Phillion, & He, 1999; Zeichner, 1990). The argument has been made that "good" teachers continue to develop over time and are always cognizant of their identities as teachers; they do not simply "act" like good teachers, teaching/being a teacher is a part of who they are. Danielwicz (2001) states, "becoming a teacher involves the construction of a person's identity . . . this involves the transformation of their (preservice teachers') identities over time" (pg. 9). Therefore, she asserts that teacher education programs must rethink and adjust pedagogy and create opportunities to enable preservice teachers to begin the development of their identities. In this paper, I argue that student teaching, as preservice teachers' initial socialization into the professional world of teaching, has enduring and indelible affects on their present and future professional development. Further, I argue that while developing an identity as a teacher is crucial to the process of learning to teach, student teaching does not always enable student teachers to develop their teaching selves.

The larger study from which this paper stems was a narrative inquiry funded by a Purdue University Research Foundation Fellowship, which is a competitive university-wide scholarship awarded to those showing promise in research. The study was designed

to explore the ways in which secondary preservice English language arts teachers characterize their beliefs about teaching prior to student teaching; what happens to their beliefs during student teaching; and finally, how they characterize their beliefs about teaching after their student teaching experience. Using Fenstermacher's (1994) categories for teachers' practical knowledge (TK-P) and teachers' formal knowledge (TK-F) as broad categories, the study also looked at how preservice teachers characterize and articulate their knowledge about teaching prior to, during, and after student teaching. When I began examining the reasons student teachers gave for the changes in their beliefs, as well as the sources they cited for their construction of new knowledge about teaching, I was able to analyze more carefully how student teachers perceived the impact of the student teaching experience on their beliefs and knowledge about teaching. It was during this part of the analysis process when I began to understand the relevance of identity development to preservice teachers' learning.

The focus of this paper is on the student teaching experience and how it facilitates (or impedes) the development of preservice teachers' teaching identity. Particularly important to me as I continue to study preservice/in-service teacher knowledge, narrative ways of knowing, and the student teaching experience through narrative inquiry is how the "traditional" 10-week, post-course work model of the student teaching experience inhibits and/or enhances identity development among preservice teachers (Bateson, 1989, 1994; Berliner, 1987; Berman, 1995; Bruner, 1991; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Cochran-Smith, 1991; Conle, 1999b, 2001; Elbaz, 1983; Phillion, 2002; Polkinghorne, 1988; Sarbin, 1987). Closely linked to identity development is the process of constructing the knowledge and beliefs that guide teachers' past, present, and future practice. The narrative inquiry from

which this paper comes examined what happened to student teachers' beliefs and knowledge about teaching during their student teaching experience. As I examined the narrative threads (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) that were related to knowledge and beliefs within and across my participants' narratives of experience, it became increasingly apparent to me that the student teachers in this project overwhelmingly felt constrained and inhibited when trying to "be themselves" as teachers.

Because student teaching is considered to be the seminal component of most teacher education programs, it behooves us in teacher education to study its effect in the process of learning to teach, particularly as it relates to the development of self as a teacher. Student teaching is typically the first time preservice teachers are immersed for an extended period of time in the context of schooling as the teacher in charge, and one of the first opportunities for them to test self perceptions of their developing identity as a teacher. When identity emerged as a dominant storyline across the cases in this narrative inquiry, it became important to examine the relationship between how student teachers (re)construct knowledge and beliefs about teaching and how their perceptions of self as a teacher evolved during student teaching. This paper is a synthesis of that particular analysis of the data from the larger study. Specifically, I will discuss how issues of power and voice emerged as important indicators/influences of identity development throughout the participants' stories. The relationship power and voice have to identity development is manifest in their stories and illustrates the tensions and relations associated with power and voice.

### **Narrative Inquiry Uncovers the Identity Storyline**

In the larger study at the onset, my intention was to design a study that allowed me to see the complex relationship between theory and practice and the process through which student teachers go when they try to negotiate a balance between the theoretical, formal knowledge of the university and the practical, informal knowledge of the school.

Fenstermacher (1994) uses TK-F (formal knowledge) and TK-P (practical knowledge) to distinguish categories for the types of knowledge teachers hold. I began with these categorizations in mind and with a goal to study how student teachers constructed TK-P during student teaching. Recently in the literature on teacher knowledge, TK-P has gained credence as a crucial type of knowledge for teachers (Carter, 1990; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Clandinin & Connelly, 1987; Cox et al, 1998; Elbaz, 1983; Fenstermacher, 1994; Grossman, 1990; Putnam & Borko, 2000; Schon, 1983, 1987; Shulman, 1987).

Field experiences in preservice teacher education programs are embedded in the philosophy that practice in the field enables preservice teachers to construct knowledge about teaching (TK-P). However, as I waded more deeply into this narrative inquiry and as I learned more about the student teachers and their experiences through their stories, I began to appreciate the complex nature of their learning and the variety of influences on and sources of their learning. Further, it became increasingly apparent that identity development was at the heart of their learning *to be* teachers.

To begin to understand the highly contextualized nature of learning to teach, and to understand what it means to become a teacher, I believe researchers must employ research methods that not only help show how knowledge is constructed and beliefs are formed, but to render such explorations meaningful and to go beyond simple categorizations and labels

for such knowledge. Narrative inquiry was a methodology that would allow me to describe and explain the complex journey that preservice teachers take when they go from student to teacher. Such a study promised to lead to a better understanding of the complicated process of learning to teach. The larger study from which this paper stems did those things and continues to enlighten my understanding of the process of learning to teach; however, to my surprise, during the course of conducting this narrative inquiry, I discovered the power of narrative inquiry to uncover stories and narrative threads that I could not have predicted (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Conle, 1999b, 2001; Phillion, 2002). In addition, I began to understand and appreciate its potential to allow researcher and participants to follow and examine unanticipated, unexpected, and unforeseeable storylines. This is the richness of narrative, and this discovery made it possible for me to pursue the identity storyline.

### **“Thinking Narratively”**

Through the lens of narrative inquiry I looked at individual student teachers’ stories and examined the ways in which they held knowledge about teaching, most of which, I found were linked to their perceived and developing identities as teachers. Like much of the research on teacher knowledge that is framed within the social-constructivist perspective (Bransford, Brown & Cocking, 1999; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Dewey, 1933 & 1938; Elbaz, 1991; Putnam & Borko, 2000), this study was conceived in the idea that understanding the contexts of individuals’ lived experiences leads to a better understanding of how knowledge, beliefs, and identities are formed. The work of people like Carter (1990 & 1993), Clandinin (1992); Clandinin & Connelly (1991); Conle (1999b & 2001); Knowles, Cole, & Prestwood (1994); and McEwan (1995) has been influential in



advancing the examination of teacher stories as a viable method for understanding teacher knowledge.

Narrative as a way of knowing underscores my approach to this study and serves as its methodological and theoretical framework. One of the underlying aims of narrative inquiry in education research is to empower teachers by giving voice to what they know, enabling them to articulate how they know, and to recognize the connections among their lived experience, practical knowledge, and beliefs about teaching (Conle, 1999a & 1999b; Connelly & Clandinin, 1999; Lortie, 1975; McEwan, 1995; McIntyre, Byrd, & Foxx, 1996; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984; Wilson, Shulman, & Richert, 1987. This study gives voice to the student teachers and lays open for examination their perceptions of identity and their precarious position within the community of teaching. The work being done on identity and the role it plays in the construction of teacher knowledge is closely related to this research strand; it informs what we are learning about the intersection of teachers' personal and professional lives and the influence those intersections have on teachers' knowledge and their classroom practice (Borich, 1999; Conle, 1999b; Britzman, 1994; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; Connelly & Clandinin, 1999; Danielwicz, 2001; McClean, 1999). So, why narrative? Clandinin and Connelly (2000) say, "The answer to the question, 'Why narrative?' is, 'Because experience' (p. 50).

Because the study is based on my epistemological stance that narrative is at the root of how people make sense of the world (Bateson, 1989; Belinky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Bruner, 1991; Clandinin & Connelly, 1991); Dewey, 1938; Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998; Mitchell, 1980; Polkinghorne, 1988; Phillion, 2002) and because the study is framed in my philosophical perspective that positions teachers as

knowers and producers of knowledge, it was appropriate that I employ a narrative inquiry approach. In an effort to understand the effect of student teaching on preservice teachers' knowledge and the development/evolution of their teaching identities, it was imperative for me to understand the contexts surrounding the student teachers' experience in their placements. Narrative inquiry enabled me as the researcher to engage in an ongoing dialogue with student teachers as they made sense of their experience through narrative. The tensions and challenges characteristic of my participants' student teaching experiences became transparent as I consciously tried to pay attention to what Connelly and Clandinin (1999) refer to as the "tensions of thinking narratively" as a framework for conducting the study. As I listened to the student teachers' stories and then through the process of retelling their stories, I became familiar with each student teacher's storied experience of student teaching and the individual tensions and pressures that characterized their experiences.

### **Entering the Participants' Stories**

Understanding the context of the placements where student teachers were assigned by the university for their student teaching is essential to understanding their learning during student teaching. Clandinin and Connelly (1996) use the term "professional knowledge landscape" to describe the complexities that define the context of schooling and teachers' knowledge of teaching and learning. They use the metaphor to describe the expansive and diverse influences of events and relationships that shape a teacher's knowledge about teaching. I invite the reader to enter into the professional knowledge landscapes of the student teachers who participated in this study. Connelly and Clandinin (1999) assert, and I concur, that it is never enough to describe the landscape from the

vantage point of an outsider, or from the distance of a “researcher.” The landscape must be understood and described from within whenever possible. Therefore, it was my intention to depict each student teacher’s professional landscape from his/her vantage point, knowing full-well that my depiction is a construction, an interpretation. The student teachers’ perceptions of the situation, their perceptions of their learning, their perceptions of their identity as teachers all carry greater significance than any description a researcher could construct of the student teaching placement and experiences. Without an understanding of the student teachers’ professional knowledge landscapes, and without being willing to enter into their stories of student teaching while they lived and told them, I would not have been able to investigate their learning through narrative inquiry.

From the perspective of a narrative researcher, it is sometimes easy to forget that we are not the only ones entering into an inquiry field -- a place and time filled with people (participants and others) already in the midst of playing out a variety of stories. My participants’ motivation to be involved in this inquiry stemmed from their desire to talk with peers (other student teaches) about what they perceived was going to be a very difficult process. Their focus, their main storyline during the project was to get through student teaching and I tried never to forget that. Because I am committed to narrative inquiry and the flexibility it allows in research design, I submit that the student teachers were the primary storytellers; it was their experience, and I played a small role in the living of their stories. I do not wish to suggest that I was merely a scribe, because I believe I helped shape the stories they told by the questions I asked, by my presence in their classrooms, and by being privy to their conversations with each other. The student teachers in this project were not “collaborators” per se; they were volunteer participants

who shared their stories of experience with me and who allowed me to enter into their stories of experience throughout the course of their student teaching practicum.

The five student teacher participants in the study, three women and two men, were from the same large, Mid-western university. The teacher education program at this university is a four-year program with a 10-week student teaching requirement from the state built into the last semester of the program. One of the men (Stephen) and two of the women (Erin and Kelly) could be described as “traditional” preservice teachers; they were on track to finish their teacher education program in four to four and half years; the three of them were between the ages of 22-24; and they were unmarried. The other two (Melissa and Joe) could be described as “non-traditional” students because both were married; they were in their fifth and sixth year respectively of their programs; and both had either started their college careers in other majors or at another institution – Melissa began in communications and Joe attended three other institutions prior to this teacher education program. Although Melissa was only a year older than her “traditional” peers, Joe was nearly 30 when he began student teaching.

Because the university places student teachers within a 50-mile radius of the university, the student teachers’ placements were similar in terms of school demographics; however the climate of each of the placements can be described as different in large part because of the student teachers’ relationships with mentor teachers. Melissa and Kelly were in the same high school, which is considered the “city” school in this area and were placed with two very different mentor teachers. Erin was placed in one of the “county” schools, which is actually very similar to Melissa’s and Kelly’s school placement in terms of student population – both are large comprehensive 9-12 high schools.

Joe's placement, which he described, as "somewhat of an anomaly" is a comparatively small 7-12 school, and is located within a neighborhood that is adjacent to the university. The average age of the faculty is older than the average age of the faculty at the other schools. Stephen's placement was in a small, rural school located in one of the surrounding counties, approximately 40 miles from the university. Of all the student teachers, Stephen had the biggest adjustment to make in his placement because the school was the most different from his own experience as a high school student, which was a large 9-12 Chicago suburban high school.

### **Defining Key Terms: *Identity, Voice, Power***

#### **Identity**

For purposes of this study, I borrowed from Britzman (1991, 1994), Danielwicz (2001), Gee (1990), and Jenkins (1996) to define identity. Danielwicz (2001) asserts, "identity is our understanding of who we are and of who we think other people are" (p. 10). The idea that identities (both our own and the identities we place on others) shift and change depending on the context, the time, the place, and the circumstance echoes Gee's idea of "multiple selves" and Jenkins' assertion that identity is a result of the "dialectical interplay of processes of internal and external definition" (1996, p. 25). Depending on the specific situation, student teachers in this study held a variety of identities during student teaching. Further, their multiple identities were determined by internal and external forces. For example internal forces like personal beliefs about how a teacher should behave shaped their student teacher identity. External forces, like their relationships with mentor teachers also shaped their student teacher identity. Often the internal forces and external forces were at odds and created tension for the student teacher. Three specific situations

represent the tensions the student teachers felt, and illustrate how identity development became manifest as an issue for these student teachers: 1) When student teachers attempted to establish themselves as the authority figure in a classroom in which they were a temporary “visitor”; 2) When student teachers felt obligated to assume their cooperative teacher’s style of classroom management and discipline; and 3) When student teachers felt powerless and/or limited in terms of curriculum and instruction decisions.

As evidenced in my participants’ stories, their sense of their own identities often shifted; it involved a sense of group identity (“we are student teachers”) as well as individual identity (“I am the teacher in charge now” or “I am married”). The student teachers in this study came to the project each with a sense of who they were as individuals in and outside of the classroom, as students and as future teachers, as citizens, as spouses, as sons and daughters, and as friends. Their notions of their own identities influenced and shifted their sense of themselves as teachers over the course of the student teaching experience. Frequently, they questioned who they were as teachers and/or the kind of teacher they wanted to be.

Important questions emerged as I began to think more about teacher identity and the complex situation student teachers are in as student *and* teacher. While viewing themselves as college students, student teachers often struggle for a variety of reasons to move beyond the role of student and into the role of teacher. Much of the struggle has to do with trying to establish oneself as the authority figure in someone else’s classroom. This paper explores how student teachers make the identity transition from student to teacher. I will discuss how, in the context of student teaching, did the participants hold and

characterize the knowledge they (re)construct about teaching and how their identities as teachers evolved and changed?

### **Voice**

The participants' stories show that they had a clear sense of their own voice and the weight it carried in decision-making and manifest in their stories is how their perceptions of their own voice changed depending on the various identities they assumed throughout the project. For example, when we met as a group, they were more confident in articulating their knowledge and learning about teaching and shows they had a strong sense of voice in a context of their peers. On the other hand, I noticed the student teachers assuming a more compliant voice and tone when interacting with their mentor teachers and even with me at times. Clearly their sense of voice and the value it had was directly linked to the student teachers' sense of their own shifting identities throughout the student teaching experience. Whether or not their voice was valued depended upon a number of factors: student teachers' perceptions of self; level of confidence; and relationships with mentor teacher, students, university supervisor, peers.

Britzman (1991) discusses the relationship between power and voice in the context of what Foucault (1980) calls, "the regimes of discourse". She explains that a "discourse becomes powerful when it is institutionally sanctioned" (p. 17). Therefore, the voices that are valued and heard within the discourse of power are the voice of those who are perceived as knowledgeable and experienced in the practices and customs of the discourse community. Clearly, the student teachers in this study, despite (and most often because of) the nature of their relationships with mentor teachers and university supervisors did not

perceive themselves as knowledgeable or experienced in the discourse community of teaching; therefore, they often viewed themselves as voiceless.

Important to this study was how this sense of voicelessness influenced the student teachers' learning. In what ways did a sense of voice (or lack thereof) inhibit student teachers from developing their identities as teachers?

### **Power**

Given Britzman's (1991) definition of power and the relationship of voice to power, issues of power for the participants in this study were inextricably linked to voice and their own perceptions of whether or not their voice was valued or even heard. Further, the perceptions the student teachers had about their position in and out of the classroom during student teaching reflected the power they believed they held and/or were denied. Depending on the nature of their relationship with their mentor teacher and the university supervisor, the student teachers in this study perceived they held varying degrees of power in terms of making classroom management decisions, curricular decisions, and decisions about their own practice as teachers.

Britzman builds on Giddens (1987) definition of power and says,

power is not an abstract thing. Power works through persons . . . A person's capacity to act in ways that act upon the actions of others is not so much a matter of individual charisma, or lack of it (p. 18).

Likewise, the student teachers in this study did not necessarily lack the ability nor the desire to assert themselves as powerful in the discourse of teaching; rather, they were inhibited by the complex context of the discourse. In other words, they often conformed to the structure of power in place, which was shaped by the mentor teachers' and university supervisors' knowledge and experience of teaching. The larger culture (discourse



community) here was the culture of teaching and the student teachers were (as most student teachers are) positioned as novice newcomers.

As I worked with the student teachers in this study and listened to their stories of experience, I began to wonder if their perceptions of power and voice were misinterpreted somehow. In conversations with mentor teachers, I heard them say that they expected student teachers to make their own decisions, to find their own way as the teachers “in charge”, and to think of the classes as their own. Yet, student teachers did not express the same sense of ownership that may have been intended for them to assume. Britzman (1991) says,

Power is relational (although not usually equal), and exercised within a context of resistance. This relationship informs its internal dynamics. Understanding the *context* of power, in concert with the *relationships* it articulates and effectuates, allows us to move beyond an abstract notion of individual autonomy to construct a cultural theory of meaning grounded in social circumstances and material practices. Moreover, any theory of power must also be sensitive to the capacity of persons to interpret and intervene in their world. Such a view of human agency allows us to raise the question: Could persons have acted and interpreted differently? (p. 19).

The same question emerges in the context of this narrative inquiry. As I reread the student teachers’ stories and as I draft and revise and retell their stories in the context of this research text, I too wonder, “Could they have acted and interpreted differently?”

### **Meet Stephen, Melissa, Erin, Joe, and Kelly**

Stephen and Melissa went into student teaching confident with their knowledge of content, with their ability to be in front of a class, and with their decision to be a teacher. I was impressed with their poise and level of self-assurance during the first seminar meeting (prior to beginning student teaching) because they were two of a handful of student teachers who volunteered to speak in front of the class that night. I felt the same way

during the first group interview, in which they appeared open and comfortable when talking with the other student teachers and me. When I talked one-on-one with each of them in their initial interviews, they talked easily about their experiences as high school students, what they believed their strengths were prior to student teaching, and their perceptions of their placement and mentor teacher.

In my experience with Erin and Kelly, I found two hard-working, conscientious, friendly, students who seemed eager to please. Although not as openly confident as Stephen and Melissa, Erin and Kelly made good first impressions and proved to be willing and cooperative participants. I remember wondering if Erin's quiet demeanor and subtle approach might prove detrimental to her in a high school class and I wondered how Kelly's preoccupation with whether or not her students would like her might affect her effectiveness in a high school class. I was confident that these two student teachers, who had been successful high school students themselves, would be successful as student teachers (Donmoyer & Kos, 1993; O'Brien, 1997; Stevens & Price, 1992). While they were honest and candid with me about their misgivings and insecurities going into student teaching, I believed initially that Stephen, Melissa, Kelly and Erin had a strong sense of themselves and the kind of teachers they wanted to be. I did not imagine at the onset of this study that identity would become such an issue for the four of them.

Joe was a different story from the start. From before I had even met Joe face-to-face, I sensed that he would be my outlier. He seemed to be operating just outside the margins when compared to the other student teachers, and I must admit that he represented in my mind the type of person who was anything but "high school teacher material". An entry from my journal just after I met all my participants face-to-face reads,

I'm not sure about Joe. He's an odd bird compared to the others. He seems nice enough, but I'm worried that I won't be able to build a rapport with him that seems required for narrative. At first tonight, I thought he was going to be condescending, but I don't think that is his intention. He does come across as a bit aloof and distant, almost guarded. I can't imagine how he'll be in front of a class of high school kids (8/21/01).

Joe was older than the other student teachers by almost 10 years; he was married; and he had come to the teacher education program from a variety of work experiences and "failed" college experiences. By virtue of his age, personality, and life experiences, Joe brought a different perspective to his student teaching experience. His experiences as a high school student were not like his peers' experiences as students. He had not been an honors student, he had never seen himself as being part of the popular social crowd, he was quiet, and said that he kept to himself for the most part. He was just different and frankly, I was concerned about him and how he would affect my study.

### **Stories of Power: Tensions Arise (Stephen, Melissa, Erin and Joe)**

Frequently, student teachers in this study lamented the challenges associated with teaching someone else's students in a classroom that belonged to someone else. Late in the student teaching semester, Melissa said,

It is the weirdest thing to be put in someone else's classroom with someone else's students and told to teach. You have to first understand the supervisor teacher's methods (Even after I referred to her teacher as her "mentor teacher," Melissa never used that term.), and then adapt to her ways (Telephone Conversation, 11/19/01).

Despite having reportedly "good" relationships with mentor teachers (Erin and Stephen), despite having confidence in themselves and their ability to teach (Melissa and Stephen), despite being given full teaching loads and full responsibility in the classroom (Erin, Stephen, and Melissa), and despite having what was described as a "strong sense of their

own strengths and weaknesses” (Research Journal, 9/20/01), all the student teachers in this study, except for one (Kelly) repeatedly told stories of frustration and impatience as they worked to find spaces during student teaching wherein they could nurture their own teaching identities. They saw student teaching as something to be endured, a hurdle to cross on their way to their own classrooms, filled with their own students, where they could finally be themselves.

The dominant storyline that surfaced in all the participants’ experiences was characterized by a tension related to the student teachers’ perception that the development of their teaching identity was inhibited in a number of ways. Participants rarely specifically said or wrote that they felt inhibited or that their development was being hindered – they did not use that language. However, they were living and telling stories about their lives as student teachers in which issues of power and voice would become central. Four of the five student teachers in the inquiry described feeling compelled to suppress their own identities and perceived their positions in the classrooms as subordinate to the cooperative teacher; therefore, they often acquiesced to the mentor teacher’s style, practices, and belief system. Often, as was the case with Stephen and Melissa, in particular, the student teachers in this study cited situations when they felt as if they had taken on their cooperative teachers’ perceived identity, and they did so in order to be successful as student teachers in their mentor teachers’ classrooms. In doing so, they described feeling uncomfortable and awkward, and described their situations as if they were biding time until they could have their own classrooms in which to do their “own thing”.

**Stephen: “Some Early, Unexpected Challenges”**

In his second week of student teaching in a telephone conversation with me, Stephen lamented in disgust, “Teaching is not at all what it’s advertised to be!” Stephen impressed me as someone who was full of energy, passion, confidence, and he had an optimism that bordered on old-fashioned romanticism. So, when he said this to me during his second week of student teaching, I almost could not believe it. When I spoke to Stephen on the phone that week, I could tell by his tone that he was tired and I could hear the panic and disappointment in his voice, which surprised me.

Never hesitant to admit it, Stephen was the most idealistic, the most passionate, and the most “ready to go out and change the world” of my participants; therefore, I think because it was early in the semester, I was as disappointed as he was that he had found teaching to be so different from what he had imagined. I was not ready for him, of all people, to be cynical and discouraged about teaching. During our initial conversations, before he began student teaching, I had admired his candor, his ambition, and his idealism; yet, I was seeing him crumble with disappointment at the first sign of challenge. While Stephen’s issues throughout student teaching centered around the challenges he faced in dealing with students he described as, “uncooperative, apathetic, unmotivated, and very low-level,” his relationship with his mentor teacher also shaped his experience and caused him to question his own identity. He often said he felt unsupported and unappreciated and questioned his decision to be a teacher.

**Melissa: “Different Points of View”**

Melissa’s issues centered around her need “to be in charge” and the challenges of being paired with a mentor teacher whom she thought was controlling and who she believed limited her capacity to be in charge. Four days before the participants began

student teaching, we met for our second informal group interview/meeting. The meeting gave them the chance to share information about their placements, what they would be teaching, and their initial impressions of their mentor teachers. We met on a Thursday evening, and they all had unit plans due the following day for their 6-week middle school methods class, which was ending on Friday. Much to my dismay, the conversation focused on their unit plans rather than their thoughts about student teaching, which would begin the following Monday. Finally, I was able to shift the conversation to their impending student teaching, and it was then that Melissa openly voiced her concerns about her mentor teacher.

She was upset because she felt as if her mentor teacher planned to be in the classroom with her “the entire time.” I had noticed when Melissa arrived at the restaurant that she seemed irritated and frustrated. I asked Melissa why she thought her mentor teacher would be in her room so much. This interested me because I had just talked to her mentor teacher earlier in the week and she had explained to me her method for “easing student teachers in” by “turn teaching with them” during the first few weeks. The mentor teacher thought it was important to give student teachers a great deal of support in the initial weeks, so they would plan together, teach lessons together, and work very closely so that the student teachers would not be overwhelmed. It sounded like a very nurturing way of being eased in to the classroom. However, Melissa did not see it that way at all. She described Mrs. O’Shea as already “very controlling” and imagined her to be the “kind of person who just hovers constantly.” Melissa said, “This will drive me crazy if I can’t be in the room by myself. How will I establish any sense of authority? How will I ever be able to try things out on my own if she is always in the room?” (Field Notes, 9/28/01).

Although Melissa came to appreciate her mentor teacher after student teaching and is currently working in the same department with her as colleagues, their relationship and the tensions that characterized it caused Melissa to feel constrained and unnatural in the classroom.

**Joe: “The Odd Bird”**

With the first e-mail I received from Joe and throughout the semester, even after I got to know him better, I wondered how Joe’s future high school students would respond to him. He set himself apart from the other student teachers very early in our correspondences, and he continued to share with me his perception of being different from the other student teachers. From primary and secondary texts, I learned that as a high school student, Joe had not had the same kinds of experiences that the other participants had described having in high school. He did not belong to the most popular group at school; he described his high school experience as being “strange” and “unusual” because he was not part of the “in” crowd. He described himself as

. . . an unusual high school student. I was more interested in theatre than sports. My favorite subjects were drama and French. I had a horrible time with math. I generally fell short of my teachers’ expectations in terms of the quality of my schoolwork. I had trouble with the social role I had as a high school student. I was very shy around girls and did not date in high school (Educational Philosophy – secondary text, Spring, 2001).

Joe often spoke of feeling separated from the other student teachers, whom he had been in several classes with throughout the teacher education program. He described feelings of being more mature, less connected, and different from his classmates. Even his student teaching placement seemed to set him apart from the other participants. He retold the story of how he had gotten his placement: that he had been turned down by one school

that had refused to interview him, that he knew of his school's reputation for not usually taking student teachers (which concerned him), and he noticed there were no other student teachers in his building. He was also constantly worried that his perceived lack of social skills would adversely affect his success as a student teacher. In an interview he said,

I have the same concerns that I did entering any new career. My ability to socially assimilate and relate to the other people there, the other teachers, I'm worried about that... I am afraid that if I don't make the social rounds and I don't get involved enough in activities, I'm concerned that they will think that either I'm arrogant or I have poorly developed social skills or something like that...and I worry that's going to undermine my ability to ask people for help (9/15/01).

I always worry about the relationship I'll have with administrators. Because I do not have the administrators' personality profile (for a typical teacher) and I know that, well, I think that there's always some friction between people bringing some new ideas to a department. There might be some friction between the department head and the department and some friction between a new teacher and an administrator or vice principal. So I'm concerned about that. I mean to me it's the same issue I've always had with supervisors, is that sometimes when I work with people that are very directive I always worry, am I really satisfying that person enough, are they content with the work I do. Do they not think am I out going enough, or that I take charge of problems enough (Initial Interview, 9/15/01).

Combined with Joe's perception of himself as a loner were his concerns about his mentor teacher's commitment to supporting him and the perceived personality conflict he had with his university supervisor. Joe did not express his concerns to me about the mentor teacher or his university supervisor until very late in the semester. The focus of his reflections and stories were on the students in his classes. He was perceptive and sensitive in issues related to his students' behavior and interactions. Not until the 8<sup>th</sup> week of student teaching did Joe reveal in a journal entry his feelings of being unsupported by his mentor teacher and unfairly evaluated by his university supervisor.



I feel like I am receiving minimal guidance in making daily lesson plans...The one thing that I feared at the beginning of my student teaching experience was that my mentor teacher's numerous health problems would become an issue. I also felt guilty for feeling that kind of doubt because I have always intended to be supportive of people experiencing difficult crises...In the beginning, I felt luckier than most of the other student teachers since I was the only one assigned to North High School. Now I felt like I am being used and neglected. I recall a dialogue that took place with my mentor teacher during my student teaching interview...she said that there were many teachers there who would like to have a student teacher, because 'a teacher can always use a helper'...I now realize that the reason my mentor teacher chose me had nothing to do with her having a particular interest in mentoring a new teacher...She wanted a warm body who would give her the freedom to come and go from her classroom as she pleased (Received 12/2/01).

My mentor teacher does not use lesson plans. It seems that veteran teachers regard lesson plans as the equivalent of training wheels...When I complained to my supervisor that I felt like I am reinventing the wheel, he responded by saying, 'Yeah, but you're reinventing your own wheel.' I no longer regard student teaching as an opportunity to acquire new skills, but as a type of hazing. From my perspective so far, student teaching is a failing tradition that only insures that young inexperienced teachers have 'paid their dues.' It doesn't support any personal or professional growth – to the contrary, it arrests our growth as learners and teachers and supplants it with dread and cynicism (Received 12/2/01).

In terms of his own voice and identity, Joe seemed to have a clear image of who he was and the kind of teacher he did not want to be, which he perceived as being very different from the kind of teacher his mentor teacher, university supervisor, and the teaching community in general expected him to be.

I think of a traditional archetype of the male teacher-slash-coach, and how distant I am from that. I have no interest in coaching for the most part. That's something I'm terrified to discuss during a job interview. Despite the fact that I am a male, I'm really not interested in athletic programs and that sort of thing. I would be happy to participate in theater, speech if I had minored in a foreign language- foreign language club and that type of thing. But, I can't really fit in to that warrior/athlete/home town hero cult. I just don't mesh well with that (Initial Interview, 9/15/01).

In working with Joe, the surprise for me came when I began to appreciate Joe's "different-ness" and recognize that he had the potential to be the kind of teacher that many high school students should have teaching them – those marginalized students who do not identify with the mainstream/dominant population of the typical high school, the ones who do not fit with the stereotypical image of the "successful" compliant high school student.

I am attracted to teaching because it is an appropriate career for me to put my ability to use empathy to good use. . . I would prefer to teach students of a wide range of abilities. I think my personality gives me an advantage for teaching students who have emotional problems with learning (Education Philosophy Assignment, Spring, 2001).

I think part of the discord that characterized Joe's student teaching experience, which he described in his journal entries, were caused by a tension in the way Joe perceived his own identity and what he believed about teaching. The following journal entry supports this point because he described his discomfort with being positioned as the authority in the classroom.

I've always been more comfortable being a tacit outsider than a charismatic insider. I think this has to do with a flaw in my character. I am afraid of standing on a pedestal and having to accept the sudden increase of responsibility that comes with having new power (1/20/01).

Although they believed it was important to do so, Joe and the other student teachers had a difficult time positioning themselves as authority figures in the classroom because they did not believe they possessed the "knowledge" to warrant a claim to authority. Therefore, they often felt as if their voices were silenced or not valued.

### **Quiet, Calm Erin – "Caught in the Middle"**

The first few times I met with Erin and observed her among her peers in first student teaching seminars, I got the impression she was shy and especially quiet in group

settings. In retrospect, her quiet voice and understated manner foreshadowed her compliance with her mentor teacher, an acquiescence that often positioned herself as voiceless. I learned that Erin was a high school athlete and successful student, who grew up in what she described as a “typical small town middle-class family.” According to Erin, she was well-liked by teachers and students, and she described her social position in high schools as “all over the place” because she had “friends in every social circle and could easily travel between the different social scenes.” In an e-mail questionnaire sent to participants I asked about the participants’ high school experiences, Erin described herself as a high school student in the following way,

I was quiet student in high school, but at the same time my teachers would describe me as a leader. Whenever we did group work, I would take charge and was often asked to take that responsibility. I was never disruptive during class. I really think my teachers would remember my work ethic if anything, especially in my English classes because those were the classes I enjoyed, so I worked harder in them (2/17/02).

I was somewhat surprised that Erin described herself as a leader because she did not take on that role in the setting of student teaching seminars. However, she was the conscientious of my participants in terms of responding to e-mail and writing in their teaching journals. Given the image I had of Erin, it should not have surprised me when she told stories of feeling powerless to implement her style of teaching.

I have learned her (the mentor teacher’s) grading procedures and attendance on the computer. I have also had to come to realize/accept that my units will really need to be done in her style. This is something that I don’t think I was as prepared for as I thought. I guess I expected for my units to cover the curriculum topics, but with my twist to the information. It isn’t that this is totally not the case, but she (mentor teacher) has so many things going on in her class at once, group activities and creative activities, that can be difficult to implement (10/1-10/2/01).

Early in the semester, Erin found herself caught between her mentor teacher and university supervisor. Erin's main concern prior to student teaching was her ability to get along with her mentor teacher and to "mesh with her style" (Initial Interview, 9/6/01). She did not see it as an opportunity, nor did she appear to believe she had the power to initiate radical change. She wanted to do a good job and she wanted to get along. After the first visit from her university supervisor, Erin found herself in an awkward position of deciding whether to implement her university supervisor's suggestions in the classroom or to continue teaching in a way that modeled her mentor teacher's style and philosophy. Somewhere in between two differing philosophies of teaching, Erin realized she was not being allowed to "do things completely" her way (Teaching Journal, 10/12/01).

### **Stories of Voice and "No Voice"**

#### **Kelly: The Teacher-Pleaser**

As I got to know Kelly, I found her to be friendly, humble, articulate, and intelligent. Her upbeat and positive attitude, which I believed helped make her student teaching experience especially positive, also made her a delight to talk to. As she told me about her high school experiences in the initial interview, I developed an image of the kind of student she had been. My image of her as a high school student was supported by her own description of herself and her social position in high school,

I guess I was one of the popular kids. Not at the very top of the pole, but up there. I had lots of friends from different groups, but my close friends and I were pretty well known. I was on the dance team, which was a big deal, and I was friends with the cheerleaders, ball players, and people in that group (E-mail questionnaire, 2/17/02).

I was struck in the initial interviews and during the first few weeks of student teaching that Kelly did not seem as concerned about the same kinds of issues the other

participants seemed concerned about. It appeared that her worry was mainly about being accepted by her students; she hoped they would like her; and she hoped she would do a good job for them. In the initial interview, she admitted being “really nervous,” which conflicted with the image I had of her as a confident presence in almost any situation. When she said that she was nervous to be in front of high school students, I almost did not believe her. In the initial interview she said,

I’m nervous. I don’t know, this is really bad for a future teacher to say, but I get nervous in front of people. Like, less in front of my peers, and more in front of younger kids – like high schoolers. And I don’t know why that is; I think because I want them to like me. . . maybe because I look younger. I don’t know. . . I just hope I do o.k. I’m just really nervous (9/6/01).

As it turned out, in addition to Joe, Kelly was also an outlier. When it came to issues of voice, she did not experience the same conflicts and tensions that the other student teachers did. Kelly reported that her mentor teacher encouraged her to make decisions and to take over the class as if it were her own. In the final group interview, which occurred during the last week of student teaching, Kelly was the only student teacher who had all positive things to say about her mentor teacher and her experiences. The two of them seemed to have bonded in ways the other student teachers and mentor teachers had not. Even though Erin and the others said they respected their mentor teachers for their experience and knowledge of teaching, they did not describe having necessarily close relationships with them in the ways that Kelly did.

Three times throughout the duration of the project, I scheduled group meetings wherein the participants talked with me and each other about their student teaching experiences. At all three of the group meetings, which were attended by all five participants, we ate together in a casual setting, which I think helped create an atmosphere

of fellowship and a tone that encouraged casual conversation. However, the tone of the final group interview was very different from the other group interviews, which occurred one week before student teaching ended. Two days after the meeting, I noted in my research journal how different the tone of the final group interview was.

The tone was different tonight, almost tense. . . I anticipated it would be more relaxed because of it being so near the end for them. I thought they would be relieved at this point. But they were more negative than I expected them to be, and a lot less reflective. Maybe they're still just too close to the experience – there's no hindsight yet. Maybe I should try to schedule another meeting after the break, but they all have such uncertain schedules right now. Surely, by the time I see them for the final individual interviews, they will have had time to think about their student teaching and can talk about their experiences without so much complaining. . . I think everyone was ready to strangle Kelly because she kept saying how wonderful her mentor teacher is and how great her experience has been (12/11/01).

Kelly's journal entries and stories about her experience showed that she worried a great deal about pleasing her mentor teacher and doing a good job for the students, but finding and establishing her voice as the teacher in charge seemed less of an issue for her. Kelly impressed me as someone who has a straightforward, positive approach to life, and I think it served her well in her relationship with her mentor teacher and with her students. Perhaps because she was so nervous going into student teaching, she believed she had nothing to lose when she explained to her mentor teacher how insecure and scared she was, but even the act of being honest with her mentor teacher shows that she felt comfortable voicing her concerns. In the final interview, Kelly explained the situation this way,

I was scared (in the beginning) because I'm not very good in front of a classroom. I'd known this for a while and it was something I wanted to work on and I knew I had to do it. I knew it was going to be uncomfortable for me, but I wanted to do it anyway to make me a better person, a better teacher. So, I just told my supervising teacher right off the bat, and she was very, very good about it. She wanted to make it (student teaching) my

experience, and gave me, not necessarily free reign, but she wanted it to be mine and I could work at my own pace and decide how I wanted to do it (1/22/02).

The other participants admitted being much less open with their mentor teachers about their concerns. In some ways they believed they should appear prepared and confident despite their individual fears and insecurities.

Interestingly, as scared as Kelly said she was to be in front of a classroom, when I visited during the fifth week of student teaching, she appeared poised and at-ease. Although she had been in charge of this particular class for four weeks, one student appeared to not know Kelly's name, and on this particular day it irritated Kelly. Her interaction with the student made me think that she had no hesitation in believing she was the teacher in charge. Speaking to her student, Kelly said, "My name is Miss Harper, Maria. I've been here five weeks...*I am* the teacher now. I'm on the record" (Field Notes 11/8/02).

Kelly often told stories about her mentor teacher that supported her feelings that she was a novice, yet respected colleague in the enterprise of student teaching. She clearly respected her mentor teacher and always wanted to please her. Kelly often said she "felt bad for students" because she knew she was not as good with them as her mentor teacher was. She seemed to have a clear sense of her own development and realized that while she was a student teacher, she still felt valued by her mentor teacher and comfortable in making her own decisions in the classroom.

**No Voice: "I have very little control . . ."**

Erin, Melissa, Stephen, and Joe all found that their voices were limited to varying degrees during student teaching. For Melissa and Stephen, it was a matter of working with



mentor teachers who they described as “domineering” and “strong” respectively. After a month of student teaching, Stephen wrote this in his journal, “I really have very little control over what happens in the classroom – what I teach, and even how I teach at this point” (Stephen, Journal Entry, 10/20/01). Stephen struggled with working with a 25-year veteran teacher who he perceived as not being able to let go completely of her classes. Melissa’s pre-student teaching concerns about her mentor teacher became a major issue for her during student teaching. Through their involvement in this narrative inquiry, my participants were given the opportunity to talk about and reflect on their experiences through the living and telling of their stories. The frustration for them was, although I was hearing, responding to, and retelling their stories of experience and despite their ability to make meaning in conversations with each other, they still did not experience the intellectual benefits of having a voice in the discourse community within which they were working – the discourse community of teaching. Because of the nature of who they were as *student* teachers, they felt limited membership in the community of teaching. Britzman (1991) reminds us that the voice of preservice teachers, particularly student teachers, is often silenced and/or ignored as they go through their teacher education programs. The students in this study told stories of exclusion, of limited membership, and of frustration. Melissa, who believed she had an unusually demanding mentor teacher said, “I really feel like I have to do things her way. I mean she is the teacher after all; she has the ultimate responsibility for these students and who am I to question that?” (Telephone Conversation, 10/23/01).

For Erin, when it came to making decisions about lesson planning and classroom management, she seemed to accept the fact that her mentor teacher knew more about



teaching and had more teaching experience, which empowered her mentor teacher with authority in the classroom that Erin did not have nor did she question. Erin's reflections in her journal from the first week of student teaching:

I have learned her (the mentor teacher's) grading procedures and attendance on the computer. I have also had to come to realize/accept that my units will really need to be done in her style. This is something that I don't think I was as prepared for as I thought. I guess I expected for my units to cover the curriculum topics, but with my twist to the information. It isn't that this is totally not the case, but she (mentor teacher) has so many things going on in her class at once, group activities and creative activities, that it can be difficult to implement my stuff (10/1-10/2/01).

Erin did not find it necessarily problematic to have a limited voice in matters of curriculum and classroom management – at least, not to the degree that Stephen and Melissa did. Late in the semester when a discipline issue arose, Erin wanted to change the seating chart, but chose not to do it because Mrs. Mc Owen (mentor teacher) advised against it. Erin often seemed to resign yourself to the subordinate position as evidenced in Erin's claims that she had a good relationship with her mentor teacher. In the final interview, she said,

In the beginning, I was most nervous about Mrs. Mc Owen and how we would mesh as far as our ideas of how to teach because I have my own ideas on everything. So, I was worried that they would not go over well, and so the first couple of weeks I was getting adjusted to her classroom and things like that, but I really got along with her well from the start. We got along really well; she was very helpful (1/16/02).

My participants' stories of experiences reveal how voice and identity can be inhibited and repressed depending on the nature of the relationship between student teacher and mentor teacher. This is not to mitigate other factors that influence a person's position in a given discourse community. For example, in the case of Joe, his perceptions of self

and his own comfort zone seemed to be a factor as much as his relationship with his mentor teacher was in matters of voice. Often in student teaching, the relationship with the mentor teacher determines how much voice a student teacher has in making decisions. However, I would argue that other factors such as: the student teacher's personality, and concept of self, her/his philosophical perspective, and the context of the placement play a major role enabling or inhibiting her/his voice during student teaching.

### **The Underlying Story of Identity**

As Stephen, Melissa, Erin, Joe, and even Kelly grappled with questions of power and voice, as they dealt with the tensions and pressures of student teaching, and as they worked to perform successfully as student teachers, the stories they lived and told revealed a number of narrative threads that were particular to their stories and to their own identity development. For Stephen tensions revealed in the narrative threads across his stories were: 1) His loss of idealism and his inability to empower students in the way he had hoped; 2) The contradictions that manifested in his stories about his expectations for student teaching; and 3) His frustration of working within the constraints of the institution of schooling (dominant mentor teacher, curriculum, schedule, apathetic students). Melissa's stories reveal that her relationship with her mentor teacher seemed to dominate almost every aspect of her student teaching experience. More importantly, she ultimately saw student teaching as the last hurdle to cross on the way to being the teacher she wanted to be. She did not consider it to be an opportunity to develop her teaching identity, and approached it as "something to get through" on her way to the start of her teaching career. She too expressed frustration at being forced to work within the constraints of her situation, but it was not the curriculum, nor the students that were problematic to Melissa;

it was the structure of the student teaching experience itself – a structure that had placed her with a mentor teacher who, at least, initially seemed not to give her the space and opportunity to be her own person.

Erin and Joe, to differing degrees were confronted with the tensions associated with working in a context where authority figures (mentor teacher and university supervisors) are in conflict with each other or with them. In Erin's case, she felt as if she were the liaison between her mentor teacher (whom she respected and wanted to please) and a university supervisor whom she barely knew. She often acquiesced, despite wanting to make her own way in the classroom. She was the good, responsible student she had always been and did what was expected of her. Joe felt unsupported by his mentor teacher and at odds with a university supervisor who he perceived as having a very different philosophy of teaching from his own. Joe would ultimately decide not to teach immediately following student teaching, he questioned his ability to work within a "normal" classroom setting and chose to pursue a masters program specializing in English as a Second Language.

Kelly, on the other hand, who described her student teaching experience and relationship with her mentor teacher as "ideal" did not experience the same kinds of tensions that the other student teachers did. She began student teaching with a number of insecurities, but held that it would be a learning experience for her and that she would benefit from it personally and professionally. I am not suggesting that the others went into student with less positive attitudes or that they expected it not to be a learning experience, but the focus of their student teaching experiences shifted from a potential

learning and growing experience to an experience in which they felt compelled to comply with structures, philosophies, and practices they did not “own” or espouse to necessarily.

### **Concluding Remarks: Implications for Teacher Education**

For the participants in this study, questions of voice and power surfaced the minute they walked into their mentor teachers’ classrooms. Their stories illustrate situations in which the participants found themselves continually in a state of negotiation as they traversed the course from student to teacher. They negotiated epistemological positions and were faced with questions about what type of and whose knowledge counts. They negotiated philosophical positions and often questioned their own beliefs about teaching as well as their mentor teachers’ and university supervisors’ beliefs. They negotiated for positions of power in and out of the classroom and were often left to wonder whose identity would prevail.

The study adds to the broad conversation related to student teaching and other field experiences in teacher education, and offers insight into what it means to learn during student teaching (Watts, 1987; Wubbels, 1992 and Zeichner, 1980 & 1987). Looking carefully at the student teachers’ stories revealed that identity, which is imbedded in structures of power and often shaped by a sense of voice, is at the heart of teacher development. It shows that the student teaching experience does not always provide opportunities to foster identity development in preservice teachers. For the most part, with the exception of Kelly, the student teachers in this study characterized the student teaching experience as a proving ground, a means to an end at which time they would “be” the teachers they wanted to be, when they would no longer feel compelled to “act” like the teachers they perceived their mentor teachers’ and university supervisors intended them to

be. The study illuminates the complexities and tensions that characterize the student teaching experience while it substantiates my argument that too often, even positive student teaching situations do not foster identity development. I argue that as teacher educators, we must rethink the traditional construct of the 10-week student teaching experience, cultivate more effective partnerships with schools and classroom teachers, and examine current pedagogy so that preservice teachers, as they make the transition from student to teacher, may begin to develop their teaching selves.

In conclusion, I return to Danielewicz (2001) and maintain, as she does, that preservice teachers must be given opportunity and agency to develop their identities, particularly during student teaching. The structure of the traditional student teaching practicum is often perceived as artificial, professionally limiting, and characterized by tension – not the kind of climate that fosters identity development. This study supports Danielewicz’s argument that those of us in teacher education need to rethink pedagogy as well as the nature of field experiences so that preservice teachers have a sense that their voice is valued in the discourse community of teaching and that they do have power to make decisions about who they are as teachers. We must create spaces and opportunities for student teachers to develop their identities as teachers throughout their teacher education programs. Learning how to teach is one aspect of the ongoing process of becoming a teacher, and at the heart of the process is identity.

(M. Michele Pittard, Assistant Professor in Teacher Education and Fellow at the Center of Inquiry at Wabash College. [pittardm@wabash.edu](mailto:pittardm@wabash.edu))

## REFERENCES

- Borich, G. (1999). Dimensions of self that influence effective teaching. In R. P. Lipka & T. M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), The role of self in teacher development (pp.92-117). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bateson, M. (1989). Composing a life. New York: The Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Bateson, M. (1994). Peripheral visions: Learning along the way. New York: Harper Collins.
- Belinky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.
- Berliner, D. (1987). Knowledge is power: A talk to teachers about a revolution in the teaching profession. In D. Berliner & B. Rosenshine (Eds.), Talks to teachers (pp. 3-36). New York: Random house.
- Berman, D. (1995) Becoming a teacher: The teaching internship as a rite of passage. Teaching Education, 6(1), 41-57.
- Borich, G. (1999). Dimensions of self that influence effective teaching. In R. P. Lipka & T. M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), The role of self in teacher development (pp.92-117). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (Eds.). (1999). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Britzman, D. (1991). Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Britzman, D. (1994). Is there a problem with knowing thyself? Toward a poststructuralist view of teacher identity. In T. Shanahan (Ed.), Teachers thinking, teachers knowing: Reflections on literacy and language education. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Bruner, J. (1991). The narrative construction of reality. Critical Inquiry, 18, 1-21.
- Carter, K. (1990). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 291-310). New York: Macmillan.

Carter, K. (1993). The place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education. Educational Researcher, 22(1), 5-12, 18.

Clandinin, D. (1992). Narrative and story in teacher education. In T. Russell & H. Munby (Eds.), Teachers and teaching: From classroom to reflection (pp. 124-137). London: Falmer.

Clandinin, D. & Connelly, F. (1987). Teachers' personal knowledge: What counts as personal in studies of the personal. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19, 487-500.

Clandinin, D. & Connelly, F. (1991). Narrative and story in practice and research. In D. Schon (Ed.), The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice (pp. 258-281). New York: Teachers College Press.

Clandinin, D. & Connelly, F. (1996). Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes: Teachers stories-stories of teachers-school stories-stories of schools. Educational Researcher, 25(3), 24-30.

Clandinin, D. & Connelly, F. (2000). Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Reinventing student teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 42(2), 104-118.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1993). Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge. New York: Teachers College Press.

Conle, C. (1999a). Moments of interpretation in the perception and evaluation of teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 15, 801-814.

Conle, C. (1999b). Why narrative? Which narrative? Struggling with time and place in life and research. Curriculum Inquiry, 29 (1), 7-31.

Conle, C. (2001). The rationality of narrative inquiry in research and professional development. European Journal of Teacher Education, 24(1), 21-33.

Connelly, F. & Clandinin, D. (1988). Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience. New York: Teachers College Press.

Connelly, F. & Clandinin, D. (Eds.). (1999). Shaping a professional identity: Stories of educational practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cox, B., Fang, Z., Carriveau, R., Dillon, D., Hopkins, C., & Nierstheimer, S. (1998). Preservice teachers' construction of professional knowledge: Teacher learning about literacy. National Reading Conference Yearbook 47, pp 508-16.

Danielwicz, J. (2001). Teaching selves: Identity, pedagogy, and teacher education. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think. Chicago: Henry Regnery.

Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. New York: Collier Books.

Donmoyer, R. & Kos, R. (1993). At-risk students: Insights from/about research. In R. Donmoyer & R. Kos (Eds.), At-risk students: Portraits, policies, programs, and practices (pp. 7-35). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Elbaz, F. (1983). Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge. New York: Nichols Publishing Company.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1994). The knower and the known: The nature of knowledge in research on teaching. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Review of research in education, 20, 3-56. Washington D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Foucault, M. (1980). *The history of sexuality*: Volume 1. New York: Vintage.

Giddens, A. (1987). Central problems in social theory: Action, structure and contradictions in social analysis. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gee, J. (1990). Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses. London: The Falmer Press.

Grossman, P. (1990). The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Knowles, J., Cole, A., & Prestwood, C. (1994). Through preservice teachers' eyes: Exploring field experiences through narrative and inquiry. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Jenkins, R. (1996). Social identity. London: Routledge.

Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R., & Zilber, T. (1998). Narrative Research: Reading, analysis, and interpretation. Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage Publications.



Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McClean, S. V. (1999). Becoming a teacher: The person in the process. In R. P. Lipka & T. M. Brinthaupt (Eds.), The role of self in teacher development (pp.92-117). Albany: State University of New York Press.

McEwan, H. (1995). Narrative understanding in the study of teaching. In H. McEwan & K. Egan (Eds.), Narrative in teaching, learning, and research. New York: Teachers College Press.

McIntyre, D., Byrd, D., & Foxx, S. (1996). Field and laboratory experiences. In J. Sikula (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 171-193). New York: Macmillan.

Mitchell, W. (Ed.) (1980). On Narrative [Special Issue]. Critical Inquiry, 7(1).

O'Brien, D. (1997). Engaging "At-risk" high school students. In Perspectives in Reading Research No. 12. Athens, GA: National Reading Research Center.

Phillion, J. (2002). Narrative inquiry in a multicultural landscape: Multicultural teaching and learning ( Issues in curriculum theory and policy). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Polkinghorne, D. (1988). Narrative knowing and the human sciences. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Putnam, R., & Borko, H. (2000). What do new views of knowledge and thinking have to say about research on teacher learning? Educational Researcher, 29(1), 4-15.

Quan, S., Phillion, J., & He, M. (1999). Nancy's conflicting story of teaching in her professional knowledge landscape. In F. Connelly & D. Clandinin (Eds.) Shaping a professional identity: Stories of educational practice. (pp. 32-41). New York: Teachers College Press.

Sarbin, T. (1986). (Ed.). Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct. New York: Praeger.

Schon, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner. New York: Basic Books.

Schon, D. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 1-22.

Stevens, L. & Price, M. (1992). How literacy tasks influence children's motivation for literacy. The Reading Teacher, 48, 662-673.

Tabachnick, B. R. & Zeichner, K. (1984). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher perspectives. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(6), 28-36.

Watts, D. (1987). Student teaching. In M. Haberman & J. Backus (Eds.), Advances in Teacher Education, 3, 151-167.

Wilson, S., Shulman, L., & Richert, A. (1987). '150 different ways of knowing: Representations of knowledge in teaching. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), Exploring teachers' thinking (pp. 104-124). London: Cassell.

Wubbels, T. (1992). Taking account of student teachers' preconceptions. Teaching & Teacher Education, 8(2), 137-149.

Zeichner, K. (1980). Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 31(6), 45-55.

Zeichner, K. (1987). The ecology of field experience: Toward an understanding of the role of field experiences in teacher development. In M. Haberman & J. Backus (Eds.), Advances in teacher education, 3, 94-117.

Zeichner, K. & Gore, J. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W.R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 329-348). New York: Macmillan.

Zeichner, K. & Liston, D. (1996). Reflective teaching: An introduction. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Zeichner, K. & Hoeft, K. (1996). Teacher socialization for cultural diversity. In J. Sikula (Ed.), Handbook for research on teacher education (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 525-547). New York: Macmillan.



U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)  
National Library of Education (NLE)  
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



## REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

### I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Developing Identity: The Transition from Student to Teacher	
Author(s): M. Michele Pittard	
Corporate Source: American Educational Research Association	Publication Date: 02/14/2003

### II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be  
affixed to all Level 1 documents

The sample sticker shown below will be  
affixed to all Level 2A documents

The sample sticker shown below will be  
affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY  <i>Sample</i>  TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

Level 1



Check here for Level 1 release, permitting  
reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or  
other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and  
paper copy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY  <i>Sample</i>  TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
2A

Level 2A



Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction  
and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for  
ERIC archival collection subscribers only

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY  <i>Sample</i>  TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
2B

Level 2B



Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction  
and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.  
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: <i>M. Michele Pittard</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: M. MICHELE PITTARD
Organization/Address: WABASH COLLEGE, P.O. BOX 352, CRANFORDSVILLE, IN 47933	Telephone: 765-361-6160 E-Mail Address: pittardm@wabash.edu
	FAX: 361-6388 Date: 4-8-03

### III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:	N/A
Address:	
Price:	

### IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:	N/A
Address:	

### V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

**ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation**  
**University of Maryland, College Park**  
**1129 Shriver Lab**  
**College Park, MD 20742**

EFF-088 (Rev. 4/2003)-TM-04-03-2003